

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,294	08/10/2001	Robert M. Best	493-27-3	8277
996	7590 08/11/2004		EXAMINER	
	L, JACKSON, HALE	MOSSER, ROBERT E		
155 - 108TF SUITE 350	I AVENUE NE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BELLEVUE	E, WA 98004-5901		3714	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>			7//
	Appl	ication No.	Applicant(s)	9
)	28,294	BEST, ROBERT M.	
Office Action Summar	Exan	niner	Art Unit	-
		ert Mosser	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this com Period for Reply	munication appears o	n the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence add	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMM - Extensions of time may be available under the provafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this - If the period for reply specified above, the maxim - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	MUNICATION. visions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In a communication. nitry (30) days, a reply within the communication will apply the communication of the communic	no event, however, may a re the statutory minimum of thirty and will expire SIX (6) MON the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this con ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s	s) filed on <i>06 April 200</i>	04		
2a)☐ This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action			
3)☐ Since this application is in condi	· ·		ers, prosecution as to the	merits is
closed in accordance with the p			•	
Disposition of Claims				
4)	is/are withdrawn fron			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to b	y the Examiner.		·	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/	/are: a) accepted o	or b)□ objected to b	y the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) inclu				
11) The oath or declaration is objected	ad to by the Examine	r. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTC)-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a classification. a) All b) Some * c) None of the price of the certified copies of the price of the price of the certified copies of the certifi	of: prity documents have prity documents have pies of the priority documents have pational Bureau (PCT)	been received. been received in Apcuments have been received in Apcuments have been received.	oplication No received in this National S	itage
The second adminest office to		and dopies not i		
Attachment(s)		 □		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	ew (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-144		5) Notice of Inf	formal Patent Application (PTO-	152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-12-04, 4-26-04</u> .		6)	- ·	

Application/Control Number: 09/928,294

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

In response to the amendment received 4-06-2004.

Claims 1-212 are cancelled. Claims 213-275 are pending.

This action is non-final

Information Disclosure Statement

Information disclosure statements Submitted April 12th and 26th, of 2004 have been considered and are enclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Application/Control Number: 09/928,294

Art Unit: 3714

Claims **213-275** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto et al (US 6,238,291) in view of Miyamoto et al (US 6,139,433) in further view of Sawano et al (US 6,544,126) herein referred to as 291', 433' and 126' respectively.

Regarding at least claims 213-275, Fujimoto (291') teaches a first game apparatus (100) such as the Nintendo 64 (Col 2:23-30) containing a first processor (11) and a first graphical processor (16) connected to a second separately housed portable game system or discrete display device (400) such as the Nintendo Gameboy (Col 2:23-30) containing a second processor (431), a second graphics co-processor (433) and a discrete LCD display device (401). Where the first and second devices transfer data (understood to encompass variables, instructions, graphics, ect) required for development of the game via a wireless or wire connection (Col 2:66-3:9 & 3:24-27). The 291' patent teaches the use of displaying separate game related info on a public display screen (600) and the private handheld screen (401) in the game of Mahjong, however the 291' patent is silent regarding the incorporation of 3-dimensional textured polygon characters defined by a plurality of body parts.

In a related application however Miyamoto et al (433') teaches the ability for the Nintendo 64 (Figure 1) to handle 3-d graphics, including multiple points of view (adjustable camera angle), characters composed of a plurality of body parts, the display of these characters (Figures 4, 23, 27 33 & Abstract). It would have been obvious to incorporate the 3-d capabilities of the Nintendo 64 game system as demonstrated in the Miyamoto reference (433') in the system of Fujimoto (291') in order to off the user greater visual detail and maintain the users interest in the gaming device.

In an additional related application Sawano et al (126') teaches the ability of the Nintendo Gameboy to process 3-D graphics (6:32-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have utilized the 3-d capabilities of the Nintendo Gameboy in the system of 433'/291' in order to allow the player to interface with a 3-d game as shown on an external viewing device such as a TV with a person controller with a handheld 3-d display to allow the player complete actions in a game without immediately revealing those actions to other players as taught by 291' (Col 1:41-45)

Regarding the limitation of a plurality of 3-dimensional body parts and similar language claims 213-224, 230-233, 235-238, 240-245, 249-250, 254-258, 262-268, and 270-275, the 291' reference teaches displaying either a portion or a subset of a game presented on a larger display such as a TV (ABS). The 433' reference teaches the manipulation of camera angle through button (ABS) the determined direction of movement or various other criteria (figure 24). When the 291' and the 433 reference are then taken in combination with the 126' reference they provide a 3-d point of view controller for displaying game characters, worlds and objects like that as shown in figure 27 of 433' in the claimed partial or full scaled depiction with the claimed detail and possible multiple camera angles simultaneously between the TV and handheld display unit.

Page 5

Art Unit: 3714

Regarding the limitation of storing a second game program in a removable cartridge as found in at least claims **226** and **260**. The 291' reference teaches the use of cartridges (500, 300) for the storage of the second program. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize removable cartridges in the device of as 291'/433'/126' in order to offer a game medium that is safe

from scratches and hence more resistant to degradation.

Regarding the limitation of the memory medium is an optically encoded disk as found in claims 225, 246, and 259. The 126' reference teaches the use of an optically encoded disk (46). It would have been obvious to of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize optically encoded disks as shown in 126' in the invention of 291'/433'/126' due to their easy of manufacture and low cost.

Regarding the transmission of the second game program from the first game system to the second game system as found in at least claims 227, 228, 251, and 261. The 126' reference teaches the second game machine processing information as distributed to it by the primary game machine (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have utilized the transfer of code as described in the 126' reference in the system of 291'/433'/126' in order distribute game processing.

Regarding the limitation of a wireless or partly wireless transmission link as found in at least claims 229, 234, and 269. The 291' reference teaches the use of wireless transmission (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize a wireless or partly wireless transmission link as demonstrated by 291' in the device of as 291'/433'/126' in order to give players greater freedom movement and/or allow the secondary game device to directly communicate with each other.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 213-275 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Issues raised regarding machine and device capabilities are believed addressed in the art as presently applied.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Mosser whose telephone number is (703)-305-4253. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris H Banks can be reached on 703-308-1745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/928,294 Page 7

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

REM

JESSICA HARRISON PRIMARY EXAMINER